

received in a slot 57 in the yoke and is anchored in place by a plurality of tapered wedges 58. The tenon end 55 and the slot 57 form a dovetail joint. (col. 4, lines 46-55) Chari et al. further describe that the inner facing surfaces of the mortise ends 53, FIG. 2, are engaged by three wedges 60, 61 and 62. The three wedges slidably engage each other and two of the teeth to form a dovetail joint. The interfaces between the wedges 60, 61 and 62 are serrated so that radial motion of the wedges is prevented. When the wedges are driven into place, they pre-load the teeth 51 in compression by forcing the mortise end 53 of each tooth outward. This pre-loading of all the teeth forms a circular supporting arch around the rotor 6. The wedges lock the stator bars 36 together into a single circumferential unit. The wedges also prevent the tenon ends 55 of the teeth from being bent in the slots 57 like cantilevers when a torque is applied to the stator bars 36. (col. 5, lines 1-17)

Claims 8 and 9 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 7 which recites a method "for fabricating a stator with non-magnetic teeth, said method comprising the steps of fabricating a back iron... attaching a non-magnetic tooth back portion comprising a plurality of non-magnetic teeth to the back iron". Chari et al. do not describe nor suggest a method for fabricating a stator with non-magnetic teeth where the method includes the steps of fabricating a back iron, and attaching a non-magnetic tooth back portion including a plurality of non-magnetic teeth to the back iron. Moreover, Chari et al. do not describe a method wherein attaching a non-magnetic tooth back portion including a plurality of non-magnetic teeth to the back iron. Rather, Chari et al. describe stator bars supported in the air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, interspaced between the stator bars and rigidly attached to the yoke of the generator. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 7 is submitted to be patentable over Chari et al.

Claims 8 and 9 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 7. When the recitations of Claims 8 and 9 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 7, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 8 and 9 likewise are patentable over Chari et al.

Independent Claim 12 recites a stator comprising “a back iron... and a plurality of non-magnetic teeth unitary with a back portion, said back portion mounted on said back iron”. Chari et al. do not describe or suggest a stator including a back iron, and a plurality of non-magnetic teeth unitary with a back portion, wherein the back portion is mounted on the back iron. Moreover, Chari et al. do not describe “a plurality of non-magnetic teeth unitary with a back portion”. Rather, Chari et al. describe stator bars supported in the air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, interspaced between the stator bars and rigidly attached to the yoke of the generator. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 12 is submitted to be patentable over Chari et al.

Claims 13-15 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 12. When the recitations of Claims 13-15 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 12, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 13-15 likewise are patentable over Chari et al.

Independent Claim 18 recites a dynamoelectric machine including “a housing... a stator comprising a bore therethrough mounted in said housing, said stator comprising a back iron and a plurality of non-magnetic teeth unitary with a back portion, said back portion mounted to said back iron... a plurality of armature windings mounted on said teeth... and a rotor rotatably mounted in said bore, said rotor comprising a plurality of field windings”. Chari et al. do not describe nor suggest a stator including a back iron and a plurality of non-magnetic teeth unitary with a back portion, the back portion mounted on the back iron. Moreover, Chari et al. do not describe “a plurality of non-magnetic teeth unitary with a back portion”. Rather, Chari et al. describe stator bars supported in the air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, interspaced between the stator bars and rigidly attached to the yoke of the generator. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 18 is submitted to be patentable over Chari et al.

Claims 19-24 depend from independent Claim 18. When the recitations of Claims 19-24 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 18, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 19-24 likewise are patentable over Chari et al.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 7-9, 12-15, and 18-24 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chari et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,278,905) in view of Lloyd et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,177,054) is respectfully traversed. Claims 1-3 are cancelled.

Chari et al. is described above. Lloyd et al. describe a rotor assembly installed and maintained in a first and single walled cryostat 16, and a stator assembly installed and maintained in a dual walled cryostat 17. (col. 2, lines 44-47) Further, the rotor is comprised of a high temperature ceramic superconductive (HTSC) material which may comprise a cylinder or disk of HTSC material 22 installed on a rotor shaft 23. The stator may be of any appropriate material. (col. 2, lines 64-68; col. 3, line 1). Lloyd et al. further describe a stator 40 comprising a plurality of teeth 42. (col. 4, lines 46-47). The stator teeth are formed, for example, of a steel material, while the stator windings may be of a conventional electrical conducting material such as copper, or of a HTSC material. (col. 4, lines 50-51). In addition, Lloyd et al. describe that it is a feature of high temperature ceramic superconducting materials that they have the ability to trap magnetic fields. Because of this feature, it is possible to produce a brushless D.C. motor 10 which has a substantially lower weight and size for a given horsepower rating than conventional motors. (col. 3, lines 5-10).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103(a) rejection of the presently pending claims is not a proper rejection. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. In addition, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only

so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As the Federal Circuit has recognized, obviousness is not established merely by combining references having different individual elements of pending claims. Ex parte Levingood, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). MPEP 2143.01. Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicants' disclosure, in the prior art to combine such references, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure. In re Vaeck, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, neither a suggestion or motivation to combine the prior art disclosures nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown.

The present Section 103(a) rejection is based on a combination of teachings selected from multiple patents in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. Specifically, Chari et al. is cited for its teaching of stator bars supported in an air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, each tooth having side walls, a mortise end and a tenon end, with the tenon end received in a slot in the yoke and anchored in place by a plurality of tapered wedges forming a dovetail joint, and Lloyd et al. is cited for its teaching of a rotor that is comprised of a high temperature ceramic superconductive (HTSC) material which may comprise a cylinder or disk of HTSC material installed on a rotor shaft, and describes that the stator may be of any appropriate material. Since there is no teaching nor suggestion in the cited art for the combination suggested by the Examiner, the Section 103(a) rejection appears to be based on a hindsight reconstruction in which isolated disclosures have been picked and chosen in an attempt to deprecate the present invention. Of course, such a combination is impermissible, and for this reason alone, Applicants request that the Section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Further, and to the extent understood, neither Chari et al. nor Lloyd et al., alone or in combination, describe or suggest the claimed combination. Specifically, Claim 5 recites a method for facilitating a fabrication of a high temperature superconducting electrical machine,

wherein the method includes the steps of "fabricating a back iron... attaching a plurality of non-magnetic teeth to the back iron with at least one key, said plurality of non-magnetic teeth comprising at least one of a carbon fiber and a fiber polymer... installing the back iron in the machine". Neither Chari et al. nor Lloyd et al., alone or in combination, describe or suggest a method for facilitating a fabrication of a high temperature superconducting electrical machine, including the steps of fabricating a back iron, attaching a plurality of non-magnetic teeth to the back iron with at least one key, the plurality of non-magnetic teeth including at least one of a carbon fiber and a fiber polymer, and installing the back iron in the machine. Rather Chari et al. describe stator bars supported in the air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, interspaced between the stator bars and rigidly attached to the yoke of the generator, and Lloyd et al. describe a rotor that is comprised of a high temperature ceramic superconductive (HTSC) material which may comprise a cylinder or disk of HTSC material installed on a rotor shaft, and describes that the stator may be of any appropriate material.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 1-3 and 5 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chari et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,278,905) in view of Lloyd et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,177,054), and further in view of Everton (U.S. Pat. No. 5,670,838) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 has been cancelled.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claim 4 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chari et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,278,905) in view of Lloyd et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,177,054), and further in view of Roger (U.S. Pat. No. 4,375,043) is respectfully traversed.

Chari et al. and Lloyd et al. are described above. Roger describes a system in which the bodies of teeth protrude radially inwards from the inside surface 4 of the magnetic circuit of the stator of a power alternator. The teeth are provided with radial wedges 22 and 24 which are longitudinally driven in and which are disposed between the large bases of a feet 18 of the teeth 14 and the bottoms 10 of the slots 6 in which the feet are engaged, to push the feet radially inwards and thus to keep the feet tangentially compressed by pressing them permanently against the side surfaces of the slots. Further, Roger describes that there are two such wedges per tooth so as to provide uniform radial pressure, namely, an outer wedge 22 which cooperates with an inner wedge 24 (see FIG. 2). (col. 3, lines 36-48).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103(a) rejection of the presently pending claims is not a proper rejection. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. In addition, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As the Federal Circuit has recognized, obviousness is not established merely by combining references having different individual elements of pending claims. Ex parte Levengood, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). MPEP 2143.01. Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicants' disclosure, in the prior art to combine such references, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure. In re Vaeck, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, neither a suggestion or motivation to combine the prior art disclosures nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown.

The present Section 103 rejection is based on a combination of teachings selected from multiple patents in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. Specifically, Chari et al. is cited for its teaching of stator bars supported in an air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, each tooth having side walls, a mortise end and a tenon end, with the tenon end received in a slot in the yoke and anchored in place by a plurality of tapered wedges forming a dovetail joint, Lloyd et al. is cited for its teaching of a stator that may be of any appropriate material, and further described as comprising a plurality of teeth, which are formed of a steel material, while the stator windings may be of a conventional electrical conducting material such as copper, or of a HTSC material, and Roger is cited for its teaching of a system in which the teeth are provided with radial wedges which are longitudinally driven in and which are disposed between the large bases of the feet of the teeth and the bottoms of the slots in which the feet are engaged, to push the feet radially inwards and thus to keep the feet tangentially compressed by pressing them permanently against the side surfaces of the slots. Since there is no teaching nor suggestion in the cited art for the combination, the Section 103(a) rejection appears to be based on a hindsight reconstruction in which isolated disclosures have been picked and chosen in an attempt to deprecate the present invention. Of course, such a combination is impermissible, and for this reason alone, Applicants request that the Section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Further, and to the extent understood, none of Chari et al., Lloyd et al., and Rogers, alone or in combination, describe or suggest the claimed combination. Specifically, Claim 5 recites a method for facilitating a fabrication of a high temperature superconducting electrical machine, wherein the method includes the steps of "fabricating a back iron... attaching a plurality of non-magnetic teeth to the back iron with at least one key, said plurality of non-magnetic teeth comprising at least one of a carbon fiber and a fiber polymer... installing the back iron in the machine". None of Chari et al., Lloyd et al., and Roger describe or suggest a method for facilitating a fabrication of a high temperature superconducting electrical machine, including the steps of fabricating a back iron, attaching a plurality of non-magnetic teeth to the back iron with at least one key, the plurality of non-magnetic teeth comprising at least one of a carbon fiber, and

a fiber polymer; and installing the back iron in the machine. Rather, Chari et al. describe stator bars supported in an air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, each tooth having side walls, a mortise end and a tenon end, with the tenon end received in a slot in the yoke and anchored in place by a plurality of tapered wedges forming a dovetail joint, Lloyd et al. describe a stator that may be of any appropriate material, and Roger describes a system in which the teeth are provided with radial wedges which are longitudinally driven in and which are disposed between the large bases of the feet of the teeth and the bottoms of the slots in which the feet are engaged, to push the feet radially inwards and thus to keep the feet tangentially compressed by pressing them permanently against the side surfaces of the slots.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claim 5 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 10, 16 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chari et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,278,905) in view of Roger (U.S. Pat. No. 4,375,043) is respectfully traversed.

Chari et al. and Roger are described above.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103(a) rejection of the presently pending claims is not a proper rejection. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. In addition, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As the Federal Circuit has recognized, obviousness is not established merely by combining references having different individual elements of pending claims. Ex parte Levingood, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). MPEP 2143.01. Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicants' disclosure, in the prior art to combine such references, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure. In re Vaeck, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, neither a suggestion or motivation to combine the prior art disclosures nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown.

The present Section 103 rejection is based on a combination of teachings selected from multiple patents in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. Specifically, Chari et al. is cited for its teaching of stator bars supported in an air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, each tooth having side walls, a mortise end and a tenon end, with the tenon end received in a slot in the yoke and anchored in place by a plurality of tapered wedges forming a dovetail joint, and Roger is cited for its teaching of a system in which the teeth are provided with radial wedges which are longitudinally driven in and which are disposed between the large bases of the feet of the teeth and the bottoms of the slots in which the feet are engaged, to push the feet radially inwards and thus to keep the feet tangentially compressed by pressing them permanently against the side surfaces of the slots. Since there is no teaching nor suggestion in the cited art for the combination, the Section 103(a) rejection appears to be based on a hindsight reconstruction in which isolated disclosures have been picked and chosen in an attempt to deprecate the present invention. Of course, such a combination is impermissible, and for this reason alone, Applicants request that the Section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Further, and to the extent understood, neither Chari et al. nor Roger, alone or in combination, describe or suggest the claimed combination. Specifically, Claim 10 depends from Claim 7, which recites "a method for fabricating a stator with non-magnetic teeth, said method comprising the steps of... fabricating a back iron... and attaching a non-magnetic tooth back portion comprising a plurality of non-magnetic teeth to the back iron". Neither Chari et al. nor

Roger, alone or in combination, describe or suggest a method including the step of attaching a non-magnetic tooth portion further comprises a plurality of non-magnetic teeth to the back iron. Rather, Chari et al. describe stator bars supported in an air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, each tooth having side walls, a mortise end and a tenon end, with the tenon end received in a slot in the yoke and anchored in place by a plurality of tapered wedges forming a dovetail joint, and Roger describes a system in which the teeth are provided with radial wedges which are longitudinally driven in and which are disposed between the large bases of the feet of the teeth and the bottoms of the slots in which the feet are engaged, to push the feet radially inwards and thus to keep the feet tangentially compressed by pressing them permanently against the side surfaces of the slots, further Roger describes that there are two such wedges per tooth so as to provide uniform radial pressure. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 7 is submitted to be patentable over Chari et al. in view of Roger.

Claim 10 depends from Claim 7. When the recitations of Claim 10 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 7, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 10 likewise is patentable over Chari et al. in view of Roger.

Claim 16 depends from Claim 12, which recites "a stator comprising a back iron... and a plurality of non-magnetic teeth unitary with a back portion, said back portion mounted on said back iron". Neither Chari et al. nor Roger, alone or in combination, describe or suggest a stator according to Claim 12 wherein a plurality of non-magnetic teeth are unitary with a back portion, and the back portion mounted is mounted on the back iron. Rather, Chari et al. describe stator bars supported in an air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, each tooth having side walls, a mortise end and a tenon end, with the tenon end received in a slot in the yoke and anchored in place by a plurality of tapered wedges forming a dovetail joint, and Roger describes a system in which the teeth are provided with radial wedges which are longitudinally driven in and which are disposed between the large bases of the feet of the teeth and the bottoms of the slots in which the feet are engaged, to push the feet radially inwards and thus to keep the feet tangentially compressed by pressing them

permanently against the side surfaces of the slots, further Roger describes that there are two such wedges per tooth so as to provide uniform radial pressure. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 12 is submitted to be patentable over Chari et al. in view of Roger.

Claim 16 depends from Claim 12. When the recitations of Claim 16 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 12, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 16 likewise is patentable over Chari et al. in view of Roger.

Claim 26 depends from Claim 18, which recites "a dynamoelectric machine comprising... a housing... a stator comprising a bore therethrough mounted in said housing, said stator comprising a back iron and a plurality of non-magnetic teeth unitary with a back portion, said back portion mounted to said back iron... a plurality of armature windings mounted on said teeth... and a rotor rotatably mounted in said bore, said rotor comprising a plurality of field windings". Neither Chari et al. nor Roger, alone or in combination, describe or suggest a stator including a back iron and a plurality of non-magnetic teeth unitary with a back portion, wherein the back portion is mounted to the back iron. Rather, Chari et al. describe stator bars supported in an air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, each tooth having side walls, a mortise end and a tenon end, with the tenon end received in a slot in the yoke and anchored in place by a plurality of tapered wedges forming a dovetail joint, and Roger describes a system in which the teeth are provided with radial wedges which are longitudinally driven in and which are disposed between the large bases of the feet of the teeth and the bottoms of the slots in which the feet are engaged, to push the feet radially inwards and thus to keep the feet tangentially compressed by pressing them permanently against the side surfaces of the slots, further Roger describes that there are two such wedges per tooth so as to provide uniform radial pressure. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 18 is submitted to be patentable over Chari et al. in view of Roger.

Claim 26 depends from Claim 18. When the recitations of Claim 26 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 18, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 26 likewise is patentable over Chari et al. in view of Roger.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 10, 16 and 26 under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chari et al. in view of Roger be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chari et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,278,905) in view of Everton (U.S. Pat. No. 5,670,838) is respectfully traversed.

Chari et al. is described above. Everton describes a stator assembly 3 comprising an armature winding having a series of angularly spaced and axially elongate teeth 9 interposed between adjacent windings 8, a back, or return path, member 10 forming a hollow cylinder around windings and teeth, and a pair of axially spaced sealing rings 11 and 12. The teeth 9 have, in radial cross section, a flared or divergent head portion 13 adjacent to back member 10 and a similarly divergent foot portion 14 adjacent the rotor assembly 4 (see FIG. 2). The head portions 13 of the teeth are very slightly spaced from the back member so as to create a magnetic back gap between them. (col. 4, lines 62-67; col. 5, lines 1-6). Further, Everton describes that the back gap is filled with resin to bond the teeth 9 to the back member 10 and the resin serves as a magnetic reluctance. (col. 5, lines 9-11).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103(a) rejection of the presently pending claim is not a proper rejection. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. In addition, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As the Federal Circuit has recognized, obviousness is not established merely by combining references having different individual elements of pending claims. Ex parte Levengood, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). MPEP 2143.01. Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicants' disclosure, in the prior art to combine such references, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure. In re Vaeck, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, neither a suggestion or motivation to combine the prior art disclosures nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown.

The present Section 103(a) rejection is based on a combination of teachings selected from multiple patents in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. Specifically, Chari et al. is cited for its teaching of stator bars supported in an air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, each tooth having side walls, a mortise end and a tenon end, with the tenon end received in a slot in the yoke and anchored in place by a plurality of tapered wedges forming a dovetail joint, and Everton is cited for its teaching of a stator assembly including an armature winding having a series of angularly spaced and axially elongate teeth interposed between adjacent windings, a back, or return path, member forming a hollow cylinder around windings and teeth, and a pair of axially spaced sealing rings, the teeth that have, in radial cross section, a flared or divergent head portion adjacent to the back member and a similarly divergent foot portion adjacent to the rotor assembly, the head portions of the teeth are very slightly spaced from the back member so as to create a magnetic back gap between them, and the back gap is filled with resin to bond the teeth to the back member. Since there is no teaching nor suggestion in the cited art for the combination, the Section 103(a) rejection appears to be based on a hindsight reconstruction in which isolated disclosures have been picked and chosen in an attempt to deprecate the present invention. Of course, such a combination is impermissible, and for this reason alone, Applicants request that the Section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Further, and to the extent understood, neither Chari et al. nor Everton, alone or in combination, describe or suggest the claimed combination. Specifically Claim 25 depends

indirectly from Claim 18 which recites a dynamoelectric machine including "a housing... a stator comprising a bore therethrough mounted in said housing, said stator comprising a back iron and a plurality of non-magnetic teeth unitary with a back portion, said back portion mounted to said back iron... a plurality of armature windings mounted on said teeth... and a rotor rotatably mounted in said bore, said rotor comprising a plurality of field windings". Neither Chari et al. nor Everton, alone or in combination, describe or suggest a dynamoelectric machine wherein the stator includes a back iron and a plurality of non-magnetic teeth unitary with a back portion, the back portion mounted to the back iron. Rather, Chari et al. describe stator bars supported in an air-gap between a yoke and the rotor by a plurality of non-conductive, glass-reinforced-fiber, supporting teeth, each tooth having side walls, a mortise end and a tenon end, with the tenon end received in a slot in the yoke and anchored in place by a plurality of tapered wedges forming a dovetail joint, and Everton describes a stator assembly including an armature winding having a series of angularly spaced and axially elongate teeth interposed between adjacent windings, a back, or return path, member forming a hollow cylinder around windings and teeth, and a pair of axially spaced sealing rings, the teeth that have, in radial cross section, a flared or divergent head portion adjacent to the back member and a similarly divergent foot portion adjacent to the rotor assembly, the head portions of the teeth are very slightly spaced from the back member so as to create a magnetic back gap between them, and the back gap is filled with resin to bond the teeth to the back member. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 18 is submitted to be patentable over Chari et al. in view of Everton.

Claim 25 depends indirectly from Claim 18. When the recitations of Claim 25 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 18, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 25 likewise is patentable over Chari et al. in view of Everton.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claim 25 be withdrawn.

The objection to Claims 6, 11, 17 and 27 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6, 11, 17 and 27 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 6 depends from independent Claim 1, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claim 6 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 6 likewise is in condition for allowance. Claim 11 depends from independent Claim 7, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claim 11 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 7, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 11 likewise is in condition for allowance. Claim 17 depends from independent Claim 12, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claim 17 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 12, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 17 likewise is in condition for allowance. Claim 27 depends from independent Claim 18, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claim 27 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 18, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 27 likewise is in condition for allowance.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to Claims 6, 11, 17, and 27 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,


Thomas M. Fisher
Registration No. 47,564
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070